

REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action mailed June 25, 2007, please enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. By this response, Applicant amends claims 1 and 17. No new matter has been added. After entry of this paper, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-19, 21-25 and 27-36 will be pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-19, 21-25 and 27-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite based on the recitations of independent claims 1 and 17; and (ii) rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, as best understood, based on unrecited language. Applicant again respectfully disagrees, traversing the rejections and submitting that the amended claims possess even greater clarity and patentable for at least the reasons set forth below. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-19, 21-25 and 27-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite, with claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 33 and 35 being rejected based on an additional indefiniteness ground.

Without acquiescence to the rejections, in the interests of expediting/advancing prosecution and avoiding additional costs, amended claims are provided above. Applicant submits that, *inter alia*, the amended independent claims under rejection, claims 1 and 17, now even more clearly articulate the subject matter to which these claims refer. For example, claims 1 and 17 have been amended to even further clarify the "frequency or resolution" parameters of the recited inventions. Such parameters being consistent, for example, with the various frequency or resolution features recited in the dependent claims and/or disclosed in the application, including but not limited to those discussed on page 5, line 22 – page 6, and page 10, line 22 – page 26, line 15. Further, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 33 and 35 now even more clearly reflect the recited sampling and detecting features (including, for example, how digital data is provided by sampling the analog video signal). Amendments consistent with these have also been

made to the other, salient claims, here. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections to claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-19, 21-25 and 27-36 under §112 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Conclusory Remarks

Applicant's claimed inventions are both definite and patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons indicated above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-19, 21-25 and 27-36 are in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early reconsideration and formal allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If the Office has any questions regarding clarification or if it would further prosecution in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing Attorney Docket No. 348162-991180.

Respectfully submitted,
DLA PIPER US LLP

Dated: September 25, 2007

By:


Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611

DLA PIPER US LLP
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248
Attorney direct: 650-833-2258